

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on April 4, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice. Further, the specification has been amended for better conformance to U.S. practice and to correct a certain informality.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-17 have been amended for better clarity and form including beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A' and changing "characterized in that" to --wherein--. Claims 1-17 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the title of the invention was not sufficiently descriptive, and required a new

title. In response, the current title has been deleted and substituted with a new title which is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner suggested adding headings to the specification. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's suggestion, however respectfully decline to add the headings as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a), and could be inappropriately used in interpreting the specification.

In the Office Action, claims 11, 14-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. Without agreeing with the Examiner, and in the interest of advancing prosecution, independent claim 11 as well as withdrawn claims 12-13 have been amended for better clarity. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection of claims 11, 14-16 and 19 has been overcome and an indication as such is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 11, 14-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,163,115 (Ishizuka). It is respectfully submitted that claims 11,

14-16 and 19 are patentable over Ishizuka for at least the following reasons.

Ishizuka is directed to a discharge lamp where the lamp voltage is detected and transmitted to a current calculating section that divides a target power value by the detected lamp voltage to calculate a target current value. A control section controls chopping operation of a semiconductor switch so as to make the target current value approximate to the lamp current value.

It is respectfully submitted that Ishizuka does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 11, which requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

adjusting parameters necessary for calculation,
said parameters including at least one of rise time
and steepness of regions of a measured lamp waveform.

Adjusting parameters including rise time or steepness is nowhere taught or suggested in Ishizuka. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 11 is allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 14-16 and 19 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from amended independent claim 11.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that withdrawn independent claims 1, 8, 12-13 and 17 are also allowable for the same reasons noted above related to independent claim 11. Claims 2-7, 9-10 and 18 depend from one of the claims 1 and 8 and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of said claims.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
June 25, 2007

Enclosure: New Abstract

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101